EXHIBIT C

```
74D1VILC
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                                05-CR-621 (KMK)
                  v.
 5
      ALBERTO VILAR, GARY TANAKA,
 6
                      Defendants.
 7
 8
                                                New York, N.Y.
                                                April 13, 2007
 9
                                                2:22 p.m.
10
      Before:
11
                           HON. KENNETH M. KARAS,
12
                                                District Judge
13
14
                                 APPEARANCES
15
      MICHAEL J. GARCIA
           United States Attorney for the
16
           Southern District of New York
      MARC O. LITT
      DEIRDRE A. McEVOY
17
      BENJAMIN NAFTALIS
18
           Assistant United States Attorneys
19
      WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
           Attorneys for Defendant Tanaka
           GLENN C. COLTON, ESQ.
20
      BY:
           JESSICA L. MARGOLIS, ESQ.
21
      IVAN S. FISHER, ESQ.
22
      WILLIAM J. DAVIS, ESQ.
      JEFFREY HOFFMANN, ESQ.
23
           Attorneys for Defendant Vilar
24
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whatever's happened has happened. But that's your call. But I don't think the law requires it. There's no privilege, okay, and we're not dealing with a *Kastigar* type of situation, in terms of a legal bar. But maybe the principle is something that will be introduced in this case. Okay?

Mr. Colton.

MR. COLTON: I guess in the interests of trying to make sure all the issues are before the Court, I imagine that we may have a debate and will have a debate on the usability and admissibility of documents your Honor has suppressed but yet ordered produced pursuant to the subpoena. So if the government is going to take the position that that vast quantity of documents that were suppressed but yet responsive to the brief form subpoena are somehow unsuppressed because they would have been received through the subpoena, I would like to know that because that informs the massive evidence that's potentially usable in the trial, the potential length of the trial and how much work is to be done. And if the government has a position, please tell us. If they don't, please ask the government to give you a position by April 27th.

THE COURT: It's pretty clear to me that the government's view is, even if something is suppressed by the modified search warrant, they get to use it if it's responsive to the subpoena. Am I wrong on that, Mr. Litt?

MR. LITT: No.

THE COURT: So you're saying you're going to challenge their use of materials that are suppressed under the warrant but responsive to the subpoena, is that what you're saying?

You may challenge the admissibility of those materials.

MR. COLTON: Yes.

THE COURT: And this is a man who wants to go to trial in July.

MR. COLTON: It seems to me, your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. COLTON: -- that Mr. Tanaka's right to a speedy trial shouldn't be hampered or hindered by the fact that the government violated his Fourth Amendment rights by the way in which they did the search. And that's a problem I'm having, and it's a problem I'm having in explaining to my client --

THE COURT: Or that the government is otherwise entitled to the documents because the subpoena that it issued was lawful.

MR. COLTON: That --

THE COURT: And we have talked about this before,
Mr. Colton. There is always a tension between a defendant's
rights to bring whatever motions it thinks are going to advance
his interest in the case and a defendant's interest in a speedy
trial. One cannot go to trial as fast as one can without
motions as when he files motions. And Congress has said that

the time is excluded, which is something I'm probably going to write on too, because you have an application somewhere in the distant past that you wanted me to waive the exclusion based on motions being filed. If you think you want to stop these materials that are responsive to the subpoena that were suppressed under warrant coming into evidence, then you can make that application. But the minute you make that application, the speedy trial clock is excluded.

MR. COLTON: The other way that we would -- I would not want to do it this way, but the other way it could be done is simply object at trial when the government seeks to put something in.

THE COURT: Not happening.

MR. COLTON: Well, that -- I think it would be an improper -- not improper -- unhelpful way to conduct a trial. So what I'm suggesting and I ask your Honor to do is, I don't want to make a motion where the government hasn't stated a position. So if we know the position, we can decide whether to make a motion.

THE COURT: You've heard their position. Anything they think is responsive to the subpoena, even if it was suppressed under the warrant, they think they get to use at trial.

MR. COLTON: Well, we will decide by April 27th whether to file such a motion. And the request I'm going to

make of the Court then is a very expeditious briefing schedule so that we don't lose any more time than is absolutely necessary. And a forecast I would ask the Court to do is to get this done within the currently existing exclusion, which still runs another month or so.

THE COURT: I'm not going to forecast my response to that request.

All right. Anything else?

MR. LITT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm around the next couple of weeks, I'm on trial, so if you need to see me between now and April 27th, I'm around. It will be at the end of the day or on Friday.

I bid you all a good weekend. See you in a couple weeks.

MR. FISHER: Have a good weekend, your Honor.

MR. COLTON: Thank you, your Honor.